DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 757 TM 820 190

AUTHOR Blust, Ross S.; Kohr, Richard L.
TITLE A Survey of Teacher Perceptions on School Conditions and School Related Conditions.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of School Improvement.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 93p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (66th, New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982); Small print in tables.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *School Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania; Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); Pennsylvania (Pittsburgh); *Pennsylvania Educational Quality Assessment

ABSTRACT

Approximately 100,000 teachers representing over 4,000 Pennsylvania schools responded to a forty-seven item Pennsylvania Educational Quality Assessment Teacher Questionnaire. Teacher responses were gathered during the regular state assessment activities conducted from 1978 to 1981. The survey included questions dealing with the degree of teacher satisfaction with: activities external to the classroom; teacher/student/parent relationships; classroom management; instructional decisions; staff relationships; and discipline. Data analysis dealt with (1) examining overall trends during the four year period and (2) detailed analysis of the 1981 data to compare teacher perceptions within subgroups for variables such as population density and socio-economic status. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED213757

A Survey of Teacher Perceptions on School Conditions and School Related Conditions

Ross S. Blust
and
Richard L. Kohr

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R.S. Blust

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Pennsylvania Department of Education

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
New York, New York

March 1982

TM 820 150

Division of Educational Quality Assessment
Bureau of School Improvement
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17108

A Survey of Teacher Perceptions on School Conditions and School Related Conditions

Ross S. Blust
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Richard L. Kohr
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Approximately 100,000 teachers representing over 4,000 Pennsylvania schools responded to a forty-seven item Pennsylvania Educational Quality Assessment Teacher Questionnaire. Teacher responses were gathered during the regular state assessment activities conducted from 1978 to 1981. The survey included questions dealing with the degree of teacher satisfaction with: activities external to the classroom; teacher/student/parent relationships; classroom management; instructional decisions; staff relationships; and discipline. Data analysis dealt with (1) examining overall trends during the four year period and (2) detailed analysis of the 1981 data to compare teacher perceptions within subgroups for variables such as population density and socio-economic status.

INTRODUCTION

Background

At a time when many school districts are financially limited in the resources that can be devoted to making improvements the identification of problem areas is crucial. Administrators often suspect that there are areas of weak performance but they lack comparative information to confirm or deny these suspicions. Thus, an analysis of teacher perceptions on school problems was performed using a sample of over 100,000 Pennsylvania teachers. With this information administrators should be able to make better decisions and better utilize resources.

Teacher perceptions of school problems were gathered as a part of Pennsylvania's Educational Quality Assessment (EQA) program. The state assessment program provides a school building assessment on each of the ten state adopted goals of quality education (PDE, 1981). Clearly, the program focus is on student testing to produce school data. In addition to the student assessment the program surveys teachers regarding their perceptions of satisfaction with several school conditions. Teachers respond to items on school conditions such as: activities external to the classroom, teacher/student/parent relationships, factors disruptive to classroom management, teacher influence on instructional decisions, staff interpersonal relationships, and discipline problems. For each Pennsylvania school participating in the state assessment, the teacher responses are returned to the administration as a part of a twenty-four page school report. State data are provided on teacher responses to each school for comparative purposes.

Problem

The investigation focused on three areas, each dealing with teacher perceptions of school conditions or school problems. First, the principle intent of the present investigation was to examine the various Pennsylvania teacher perceptions of school conditions. Second, teacher perceptions for the two largest urban areas in Pennsylvania, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, were examined. This was to determine if those urban teacher perceptions were different from the teachers in the other Pennsylvania school districts. Third, teacher perceptions on school conditions were analyzed with respect to a series of control variables which were the following: socio-economic status, student perception of parental interest, population density (urban, suburban, rural), years of teaching experience, teacher education level, class size, hiring practices (outsider, insider) and grade level (elementary, intermediate, secondary).

METHOD

Questionnaire

The Pennsylvania EQA Teacher Questionnaire is composed, in part, of thirty-nine items subdivided into six major categories. The conceptual structure guiding the formulation of items derived from issues surfacing in the research literature on teacher satisfaction as well as EQA field experience. The items were

designed to measure a construct regarding problems perceived to influence student achievement and attitudes. Each item, describing a particular problem was responded to in terms of the degree to which that problem area existed in the current teaching assignment. The following definitions were used to expand the meaning of each response option:

Not a problem--has little or no effect on student performance
Moderate problem--has only limited effect on student performance
Serious problem--has considerable effect on student performance
Critical problem--has crucial effect on student performance

The six major categories of items are teacher perception of activities external to the classroom (five items), teacher/student/parent relationships (nine items), factors disruptive to classroom management (eight items), teacher influence upon instructional decisions (nine items), staff interpersonal relationships (three items) and discipline problems (five items).

During the original instrument construction, the items were critiqued by a school district advisory committee. Following modifications based on the review, a field test was conducted with over 700 teachers. Further refinements to items followed standard item analysis procedures. A factor analysis verified the reasonableness of the logical structure of the instrument. Internal consistency reliability estimates were consistent across elementary, intermediate and secondary teacher groups. In 1981, the coefficient Alpha reliability estimates ranged from .64 to .88 for the six item categories. A copy of the teacher questionnaire items was placed in Appendix A.

An additional three items were included on the questionnaire to gather teacher demographic information on teacher experience, education level and employer hiring practices. Also, an item was included on teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents and parent groups. An item was presented to determine the average class size for each teacher. All of these items were placed in Appendix B.

The same questionnaire was answered by teachers of the elementary, junior high or middle school and senior high level. Elementary teachers were those teachers who taught in the various Pennsylvania elementary schools. Thus, there was some variation in the grade levels taught by elementary teachers in this study. Intermediate teachers were Pennsylvania teachers employed in either junior high or middle schools. Secondary teachers were those teachers employed in Pennsylvania high schools. This questionnaire was used from 1978 through 1981 without any modifications.

Data Collection

The data for this investigation originated from a total of over 100,000 teachers, from over 4,000 Pennsylvania Schools, responding to the EQA Teacher Questionnaire. These data were gathered over four years from 1978 to 1981 during March of each year.

Data from the 1981 assessment were used to conduct a major part of the investigation. For 1981 over 41,000 teachers from 1,550 Pennsylvania schools responded to the questionnaire. Represented were teachers from 930 elementary schools, 341 junior high or middle schools and 279 high schools. There were approximately 15,670 elementary teachers, 11,740 junior high or middle school teachers and 13,940 senior high school teachers included in the survey. In 1981 approximately one-third of the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh City teachers were surveyed.

Analysis of Data

Initially, the response distributions of teacher perceptions on each item were analyzed for trends during the four year period. The response options presented to teachers for each item were: "Not a Problem", "Moderate Problem", "Serious Problem" and "Critical Problem." The percentage of teachers selecting each option was used as one means of interpreting the teacher item data to school administrators. It was hoped that this approach would permit a straight forward presentation of data. The statewide item replies were presented by elementary, intermediate and secondary teachers separately.

Percentages were examined for all school condition areas and items to determine if teacher responses were stable over the four years studied. The differences in teacher perceptions between school condition areas were of special interest as were differences between teacher responses on items. Thus, positive and negative teacher responses for items and school condition areas were easily identified for a large sample of Pennsylvania teachers.

Another part of the analysis investigated changes that took place in 1981 due to Philadelphia and Pittsburgh city teachers being surveyed. In 1978 through 1980 urban areas other than Philadelphia and Pittsburgh were included in the EQA teacher survey. Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers were included only in 1981. Thus, the question if teachers from the two urban areas had perceptions that were different from the remainder of the state, was of some interest.

Since the same items were presented to teachers at the elementary, junior high or middle school and senior high school levels comparisons were made between teachers at three levels. In order to examine differences between teachers at different grade levels both the 1981 data and the data over 1978 to 1981 were utilized. The 1981 data was selected since it was the only year which included part of the teachers from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh city schools plus the usual representative sample from other Pennsylvania school districts.

A series of control variables were utilized to continue the analysis of teacher responses. The control variables included: socio-economic status, student perception of parental interest, population density, years of teaching experience, teacher education level, class size, hiring practices and grade level category. Analysis of variance was employed to determine if significant differences between control variable groups were present. Also, mean scores were calculated for control variable groups on the school condition areas. This provided comparisons between the perceptions of teachers in different settings such as urban, suburban, and rural.

STATEWIDE RESULTS

Elementary Teacher Analysis

Presented in Tables 1, 2 and 3 were the teacher response percentages for items grouped under their general school condition areas such as activities external to the classroom, teacher/student/parent relationships and others. Data for 1978 through 1981 were shown for each item.

The elementary teacher responses, displayed in Table 1, remained rather stable over the four years examined. For example, the item "There are too few activities which recognize the talent of our students" found under the "activities external to the classroom" area had teacher responses that changed only slightly. The "Not a Problem" response percentages varied from 41 percent in 1979 to 45 percent in 1980 with 1978 and 1981 at 43 percent. For the same item the "Moderate Problem" percentages changed from a high of 44 percent in 1979 to a low of 41 percent in 1981. The "Serious Problem" percentages were either 11 percent or 12 percent, and the "Critical Problem" percentages were either 2 percent or 3 percent. This type of stability was found in all items over the four years included in the study. It would seem reasonable to suggest that the stability was in part due to the large number of teachers sampled and the relatively short period of time examined. Although, Pennsylvania's education systems have been subject to changes from 1978 to 1981 those changes have not been reflected in the teacher data collected.

Another method of examining the teacher responses was to compare percentages between items. The item, that the highest percentage of elementary teachers indicated was "Not a Problem", was "The different races or ethnic groups don't get along well together." For the item on race and ethnic group relations 85 percent, for three years, and 89 percent, for 1979, of the teachers indicated it was not a problem. There were other items where teacher responses were rather positive with over 60 percent of the teachers responding that it was not a problem, such as the following: "The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning." "The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students." "My students are chronically absent from school." "Lack of freedom to teach the way I want to makes me less effective with my students." "The support staff in this school is not cooperative." and "The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together." All of the items with a high percentage of positive responses noted previously were from one of three general school condition areas. The three areas were "factors disruptive to classroom management" and "teacher influence upon instructional decisions" and "staff interpersonal relationships." This information was encouraging since teachers were indicating most of the factors disruptive to classroom management were not a problem, and that the staff was able to work together.

Some items identified problem areas based on the elementary teacher perceptions. The most negative elementary teacher responses were on the item: "In-service education provided by the district does not meet my needs." Teachers indicated this was a "Critical Problem" with 21 percent in 1978, 15 percent in 1979, 14 percent in 1980 and 13 percent in 1981 of the teachers selecting that option. Another item with a high percentage of teachers selecting the "Critical Problem" response was "Too little support on discipline is given by parents."

For two of the items a low percentage of the elementary teachers responded that it was "Not a Problem" indicating most teacher responses were in the moderate to critical problem range. For example, only 16 percent to 19 percent of the teachers indicated "...parents taking little or no interest in their children's school work" was not a problem. This was a rather negative finding. It would have been much better to have teachers work with parents who were interested in the student's school work (This statement assumes teacher perceptions are, in general, correct.) There was another item with teacher responses in the teens under the not a problem category. The item was "Students in this school have poor study habits."

TABLE I
STATEWIDE ITEM REPLIES FROM ELEMENTARY TEACHERS FOR 1978 THROUGH 1981
(By Percentages)

	Very Satisfied				Somewhat Satisfied				Somewhat Dissatisfied				Very Dissatisfied			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
TSATPAR (Teacher Satisfaction with Relationships with Parents) In your teaching situation, how satisfied are you with your relationships with parents and parent groups?	40	38	40	35	47	49	49	49	11	10	9	12	2	2	2	3

	Not a Problem				Moderate Problem				Serious Problem				Critical Problem			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
EXTRACT (Activities External to the Classroom)																
There are too few activities which recognize the talent of our students.	43	41	45	43	43	44	42	41	12	12	11	12	2	3	2	2
There is little emphasis on vocational development.	49	51	50	50	33	32	32	32	12	11	11	11	4	3	3	4
There is no time or place for students and teachers to interact outside of the classroom.	44	45	48	46	38	39	37	38	13	12	11	12	3	3	3	4
Not enough teachers are involved in helping students overcome problems.	53	52	55	52	35	37	35	35	9	9	8	9	2	2	2	2
Not enough teachers actively participate in extracurricular activities.	50	49	50	51	37	37	36	36	10	10	10	10	2	2	2	2
TRELATE (Teacher/Student/Parent Relationships)																
The students in this school aren't really interested in learning.	40	35	38	35	50	55	53	54	8	8	7	9	1	1	1	2
Too many of my students are indifferent to school.	43	40	43	39	45	48	46	47	10	11	10	12	2	2	1	2
There is not enough parent-teacher interaction.	39	38	43	39	41	45	43	42	15	13	11	14	4	3	3	5
Too many parents take little or no interest in their children's school work.	19	16	19	18	46	51	51	49	25	25	23	23	9	8	7	9
The quality of teacher-parent interaction is not good.	44	42	46	42	40	45	41	42	11	9	8	11	3	2	2	3

TABLE I (Continued)

	Not a Problem				Moderate Problem				Serious Problem				Critical Problem			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
When a problem arises involving a community group, the teachers have little input into the solution.	29	29	30	29	41	43	43	42	21	20	20	19	8	7	5	7
The parents do not support what the school does.	37	34	38	36	44	49	48	45	14	14	12	14	4	3	2	4
The parents do not place a high value on education.	35	31	34	31	42	47	47	46	17	17	14	16	5	4	4	6
Students in this school have poor study habits.	14	12	14	12	49	54	55	52	27	27	24	26	9	7	7	9
DISRUPT (Factors Disruptive to Classroom Management)																
The different races or ethnic groups don't get along well together.	85	89	85	85	13	9	13	12	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	1
The achievement levels of my students are too heterogeneous.	37	39	40	38	45	45	44	44	14	12	11	12	4	3	3	4
Health and nutrition problems seem to affect the learning of my students.	55	51	53	51	34	39	37	38	9	8	8	9	2	2	2	2
The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning.	84	84	83	84	11	[illegible]	12	11	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1
The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students.	73	73	73	75	23	23	23	20	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1
My students are chronically absent from school.	66	65	66	65	27	30	29	29	5	4	4	4	1	1	1	2
There are too many outside interruptions during class periods.	47	47	46	45	35	36	37	38	12	11	12	11	6	5	4	6
I have to spend too much time on non-instructional duties.	39	37	37	38	36	40	40	38	16	15	15	15	8	8	7	8
INFLUENC (Teacher Influence Upon Instructional Decisions)																
Physical facilities of this school limit the kinds of programs provided for students.	43	45	45	48	31	33	33	31	15	14	13	12	10	8	8	8
I work with too many students each day.	45	51	49	50	31	32	33	30	15	11	11	12	9	6	7	8
Lack of freedom to teach the way I want to makes me less effective with my students.	73	73	76	72	19	20	19	19	5	4	3	5	2	2	2	2
Teachers have little control over matters such as textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs.	50	50	54	54	33	35	33	33	11	10	9	9	6	5	4	4
When new curriculum programs are initiated, I am not consulted or trained.	50	50	53	54	33	34	33	31	11	10	9	9	5	4	4	4

TABLE I (Continued)

	Not a Problem				Moderate Problem				Serious Problem				Critical Problem			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
My teaching is limited by the quality of, or lack of, instructional equipment and materials.	57	57	59	57	31	32	31	31	9	8	7	8	3	2	2	4
Having to teach special education students in regular classes is a problem.	53	54	52	50	25	27	29	29	13	12	12	12	8	6	6	8
There is too little teacher input in solving administrative problems.	29	27	29	30	40	43	44	42	20	19	17	17	10	9	8	9
In-service education provided by the district does not meet my needs.	21	24	23	26	33	38	39	38	25	22	23	22	21	15	14	13
TSTAFF (Staff Interpersonal Relationships)																
The support staff in this school is not cooperative.	77	79	78	76	17	16	17	18	4	3	3	4	1	1	1	2
The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together.	75	75	72	72	19	20	22	22	4	3	4	4	1	1	2	2
There is little interaction among teachers in this school, i.e. everyone is doing his/her own thing.	54	56	55	53	33	34	34	35	9	7	8	8	3	3	3	3
DISCPROB (Discipline Problems)																
Too much time is spent on discipline problems.	43	44	43	40	36	37	39	37	14	13	12	14	6	5	4	9
The values held by the students are in conflict with those of the school.	45	43	44	40	40	43	42	41	12	11	10	13	3	3	2	5
Too little support on discipline is provided by administrators.	50	47	52	48	29	30	31	30	13	14	12	13	8	8	5	9
Too little support on discipline is given by parents.	23	21	22	21	41	45	47	45	25	24	23	23	10	10	8	12
Disruption of my class(es) by students is a continuing frustration.	48	47	48	44	34	37	37	36	12	10	11	12	6	5	4	8

In summary, elementary teachers were most negative on the areas of: in-service education, support on discipline by parents, parent interest in students school work and study habits. Elementary teachers were most positive on the responses for: race and ethnic group relations, emphasis on athletics, competition for grades, freedom to select teaching strategies, student absenteeism, support staff cooperation and teachers working together. As noted previously the most positive responses were from three areas: classroom management, teacher influence and staff interpersonal relationships. The most negative responses were from the areas of: teacher influence upon instructional decisions, discipline problems, and teacher/student/parent relationships. Teacher influence upon instructional decisions was the only general area that had one item on the most positive list and one item on the most negative list. It was tempting to make the statement that the most negative responses were student and parent centered while the positive areas were to some degree under the school's control and dealt with teachers and school staff.

Intermediate Teacher Analysis

The analysis for intermediate teachers was performed using the same format employed on the elementary teacher data. The intermediate teacher responses, presented in Table 2, were rather stable over the years examined. This stability was similar to that displayed by the elementary teachers. In general, precentages changed only 1 to 4 percent over four years. There was not a trend of increasingly positive or negative responses on the part of Pennsylvania intermediate teachers in this study.

A review of the percentages between items revealed the most positive and negative areas. There was considerable similarity between the elementary and intermediate teachers on the items both groups selected as the positive areas and the items selected as negative areas. One important difference between elementary and intermediate teachers was found. A higher percentage of the intermediate teachers responded using the "Serious" or "Critical Problem" options than did the elementary teachers. In other words the elementary teachers were less negative, but both groups of teachers selected many of the same problem areas. Similar findings were reported by Earp (1975) with primary teachers being more positive than intermediate teachers.

Intermediate teachers were most positive on the following items with over 60 percent of the teachers indicating the area was not a problem. "The different races or ethnic groups don't get along well together." "The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students." "Lack of freedom to teach the way I want to makes me less effective with my students." "Teachers have little control over matters such as textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs." "The support staff in this school is not cooperative." "The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together." A few differences were found between the elementary and intermediate teacher perceptions. Intermediate teachers did not note emphasis on athletics and chronic student absenteeism as "not" being a problem, but one additional item was mentioned (teacher influence on textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs) that elementary teachers did not include.

Several items had a relatively high percentage of intermediate teachers selecting the area as a problem. For example, more than 10 percent of the teachers for each of the four years, indicated the following items were a "Critical Problem." "Too many parents take little or no interest in their children's school work."

TABLE 2
STATEWIDE ITEM REPLIES FROM INTERMEDIATE TEACHERS FOR 1978 THROUGH 1981
(By Percentages)

	Very Satisfied				Somewhat Satisfied				Somewhat Dissatisfied				Very Dissatisfied			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
TSATPAR (Teacher Satisfaction with Relationships with Parents)																
In your teaching situation, how satisfied are you with your relationships with parents and parent groups?	21	20	22	21	53	53	54	53	20	22	19	20	4	5	4	5

	Not a Problem				Moderate Problem				Serious Problem				Critical Problem			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
EXTRACT (Activities External to the Classroom)																
There are too few activities which recognize the talent of our students	42	39	42	41	38	41	38	38	14	15	15	16	4	4	4	5
There is little emphasis on vocational development.	45	51	48	47	38	34	35	36	13	11	12	11	5	4	4	5
There is no time or place for students and teachers to interact outside of the classroom.	39	42	42	41	40	41	39	39	15	13	14	14	5	4	5	5
Not enough teachers are involved in helping students overcome problems.	31	31	33	32	45	49	49	48	18	15	15	16	4	4	4	4
Not enough teachers actively participate in extracurricular activities.	36	34	33	33	39	42	42	43	18	18	19	18	6	5	6	5
TRELATE (Teacher/Student/Parent Relationships)																
The students in this school aren't really interested in learning.	11	8	11	11	56	59	60	58	27	27	24	24	7	6	5	6
Too many of my students are indifferent to school.	13	9	13	12	48	51	53	51	31	32	28	29	8	8	6	8
There is not enough parent-teacher interaction.	17	16	20	18	43	47	47	46	29	28	26	25	10	9	7	10
Too many parents take little or no interest in their children's school work.	6	5	7	7	34	36	39	38	40	41	39	38	19	18	15	17
The quality of teacher-parent interaction is not good.	22	19	23	22	47	51	50	48	22	23	19	21	6	5	4	6

TABLE 2 (Continued)

	Not a Problem				Moderate Problem				Serious Problem				Critical Problem			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
When a problem arises involving a community group, the teachers have little input into the solution.	20	19	20	19	38	41	42	42	28	28	26	26	12	11	11	11
The parents do not support what the school does.	20	17	20	20	49	53	54	52	23	23	20	21	7	7	5	6
The parents do not place a high value on education.	17	13	17	17	42	47	49	46	29	29	25	27	11	10	8	9
Students in this school have poor study habits.	3	2	3	3	31	32	37	35	42	45	41	41	24	21	18	20
DISRUPT (Factors Disruptive to Classroom Management)																
The different races or ethnic groups don't get along well together.	78	84	79	80	17	13	18	16	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
The achievement levels of my students are too heterogeneous.	27	27	27	27	46	48	49	48	20	18	17	17	7	5	5	6
Health and nutrition problems seem to affect the learning of my students.	55	52	52	51	34	39	39	39	8	7	7	8	2	2	2	2
The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning.	53	54	54	54	30	30	32	32	11	10	8	9	6	5	5	5
The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students.	65	68	67	70	28	27	28	26	4	4	4	3	2	1	1	1
My students are chronically absent from school.	35	34	34	36	42	48	49	47	16	13	12	12	7	6	4	5
There are too many outside interruptions during class periods.	39	38	38	38	37	40	42	40	15	13	13	14	9	8	6	8
I have to spend too much time on non-instructional duties.	38	42	38	38	38	38	39	39	16	13	15	15	8	6	7	7
INFLUENC (Teacher Influence Upon Instructional Decisions)																
Physical facilities of this school limit the kinds of programs provided for students.	37	38	39	38	30	33	34	33	18	17	16	16	14	12	11	13
I work with too many students each day.	36	42	43	44	34	35	34	33	18	15	14	13	12	9	8	9
Lack of freedom to teach the way I want to makes me less effective with my students.	74	75	76	75	18	18	18	18	5	4	4	4	2	3	2	2
Teachers have little control over matters such as textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs.	62	61	64	61	25	27	26	28	8	8	6	7	4	4	3	4
My teaching is limited by the quality of, or lack of, instructional equipment and materials.	56	55	56	56	28	29	29	29	10	10	10	9	5	6	5	5
When new curriculum programs are initiated, I am not consulted or trained.	50	50	54	50	33	35	32	33	11	10	10	11	5	5	4	6

TABLE 2 (Continued)

	Not a Problem				Moderate Problem				Serious Problem				Critical Problem			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
Having to teach special education students in regular classes is a problem.	50	49	45	45	24	28	30	31	15	13	14	14	10	9	9	9
There is too little teacher input in solving administrative problems.	23	23	23	24	39	42	43	42	23	21	20	20	14	12	12	13
In-service education provided by the district does not meet my needs.	17	19	18	20	28	34	34	34	27	25	26	25	28	21	22	20
TSTAFF (Staff Interpersonal Relationships)																
The support staff in this school is not cooperative.	64	68	69	67	26	24	23	24	7	5	5	6	3	2	3	3
The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together.	65	63	62	61	27	30	30	31	6	5	6	6	2	2	2	2
There is little interaction among teachers in this school, i.e., everyone is doing his/her own thing.	38	38	37	37	41	44	44	43	15	13	13	13	5	5	5	6
DISCPROB (Discipline Problems)																
Too much time is spent on discipline problems.	34	36	38	36	34	38	39	36	19	17	15	17	13	9	7	10
The values held by the students are in conflict with those of the school.	18	16	19	18	43	49	49	46	28	26	23	25	10	9	8	10
Too little support on discipline is provided by administrators.	35	39	46	41	32	33	32	31	18	16	13	16	14	12	8	11
Too little support on discipline is given by the parents.	9	8	11	10	32	38	42	40	35	34	31	32	23	20	16	18
Disruption of my class(es) by students is a continuing frustration.	37	37	40	37	35	40	39	39	17	15	14	15	11	8	7	10

"When a problem arises involving a community group the teachers have little input into the solution." "Students in this school have poor study habits." "Physical facilities of this school limit the kinds of programs provided for students." "There is too little teacher input in solving administrative problems." "In-service education provided by the district does not meet my needs." "Too little support on discipline is given by the parents." This list included all of the items selected by elementary teachers as problems, and added several more items. Overall a higher percentage of intermediate teachers selected the "Serious" or "Critical Problem" options when they responded to items where they had negative perceptions. On several items where intermediate teachers were positive they selected the "Not a Problem" option in percentages close to those of the elementary teachers.

To summarize, intermediate teachers were most positive on the items: race or ethnic relations, competition for grades, freedom to select teaching strategies, teacher control over textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs, support staff cooperation and teachers working together. The most negative teacher responses were on the items: parental interest in student's work, teacher input into solving community problems, student study habits, facilities limiting programs, teacher input into solving administrative problems, in-service education not meeting teacher needs and parental support on discipline. As was the case with elementary teachers, negative responses were from the areas of: teacher/student/parent relationship, teacher influence upon instructional decisions and discipline problems, while positive responses were under: factors disruptive to classroom management, teacher influence upon instructional decisions and staff interpersonal relationships. The area of teacher influence upon instructional decisions was found to have some of the most positive and most negative teacher responses depending on the topic of the item.

Secondary Teacher Analysis

The same format was used in preparing Table 3, containing response percentages for secondary teachers as was used for Tables 1 and 2. The secondary teacher responses were similar to the elementary and intermediate teachers in the stability of responses over the four years. Most of the percentages changed only 1 percent to 4 percent over the years studied. As was the case with the elementary and intermediate teachers neither a clear trend of more positive or negative responses was evident.

The most positive teacher responses for secondary teachers were similar to those of intermediate teachers. Positive items selected by secondary teachers were as follows: race or ethnic group relations, freedom to select teaching strategies, teacher control over textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs and support staff cooperation. All of those items were selected by intermediate teachers as positive areas.

As might be suspected the negative teacher responses for secondary and intermediate teachers were similar. Some negative items selected by secondary teachers included: parental interest in student's work, teacher input into solving administrative problems, in-service education not meeting teacher needs and parental support on discipline. The same criteria were used to identify positive and negative areas for secondary teachers as was employed for intermediate teachers. The positive items had 60 percent or higher of the teachers for each year indicating it was not a problem. Negative items had 10 percent or higher of the teachers indicating, for each year, it was a critical problem.

TABLE 3
STATEWIDE ITEM REPLIES FROM SECONDARY TEACHERS FOR 1978 THROUGH 1981
(By Percentages)

	Very Satisfied				Somewhat Satisfied				Somewhat Dissatisfied				Very Dissatisfied			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
TSATPAR (Teacher Satisfaction with Relationships with Parents)																
In your teaching situation, how satisfied are you with your relationships with parents and parent groups?	21	20	22	20	50	51	53	50	22	22	20	22	6	5	5	7

	Not a Problem				Moderate Problem				Serious Problem				Critical Problem			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
EXTRACT (Activities External to the Classroom)																
There are too few activities which recognize the talent of our students.	46	43	45	45	38	39	37	36	13	13	14	14	4	3	4	4
There is little emphasis on vocational development.	53	58	56	56	33	31	32	32	11	8	9	9	3	3	2	3
There is no time or place for students and teachers to interact outside of the classroom.	36	38	38	39	41	42	42	41	17	15	15	15	6	4	4	6
Not enough teachers are involved in helping students overcome problems.	25	26	26	27	49	52	52	51	20	18	18	18	4	4	4	4
Not enough teachers actively participate in extracurricular activities.	31	28	28	28	42	44	44	43	20	20	21	22	7	7	6	7
TRELATE (Teacher/Student/Parent Relationships)																
The students in this school aren't really interested in learning.	8	6	7	8	56	57	60	57	29	30	27	28	7	7	6	7
Too many of my students are indifferent to school.	10	8	9	10	48	48	52	48	34	35	32	33	9	8	7	9
There is not enough parent-teacher interaction.	13	12	13	14	42	46	47	45	32	30	30	29	13	10	9	11
Too many parents take little or no interest in their children's school work.	5	4	5	5	32	35	37	37	43	42	42	39	20	19	16	18
The quality of teacher-parent interaction is not good.	18	16	18	18	46	50	51	50	25	25	23	23	8	6	6	7
When a problem arises involving a community group, the teachers have little input into the solution.	16	17	17	16	39	41	41	41	30	29	29	28	13	12	11	13

TABLE 3 (Continued)

	Not a Problem				Moderate Problem				Serious Problem				Critical Problem			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
The parents do not support what the school does.	16	15	17	18	50	52	54	51	27	24	22	23	7	7	6	7
The parents do not place a high value on education.	14	12	15	15	44	47	48	45	31	30	28	29	11	10	9	10
Students in this school have poor study habits.	2	2	2	3	29	32	35	33	46	46	44	42	23	20	18	22
DISRUPT (Factors Disruptive to Classroom Management)																
The different races or ethnic groups don't get along well together.	78	81	75	76	18	16	21	18	3	2	3	3	1	1	1	1
The achievement levels of my students are too heterogeneous.	21	22	22	21	48	51	52	51	22	21	19	20	7	6	5	6
Health and nutrition problems seem to affect the learning of my students.	58	54	53	52	34	37	38	37	6	6	7	8	1	1	1	2
The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning.	39	40	41	40	36	38	39	39	15	14	13	13	9	8	7	8
The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students.	57	62	59	62	34	32	33	31	7	5	6	5	2	1	1	2
My students are chronically absent from school.	22	23	22	22	43	50	50	47	22	19	20	20	12	8	8	11
There are too many outside interruptions during class periods.	30	30	30	31	41	45	45	43	18	17	16	15	11	8	8	10
I have to spend too much time on non-instructional duties.	34	36	32	33	39	40	41	41	19	16	18	17	8	7	8	9
INFLUENC (Teacher Influence Upon Instructional Decisions)																
Physical facilities of this school limit the kinds of programs provided for students.	36	37	38	39	32	35	36	34	18	18	16	16	13	11	10	10
I work with too many students each day.	42	47	47	47	34	34	33	33	15	13	12	12	8	7	7	7
Lack of freedom to teach the way I want to makes me less effective with my students.	77	77	78	77	17	17	16	17	4	3	3	4	2	2	2	2
Teachers have little control over matters such as textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs.	64	63	68	64	25	27	24	26	7	6	5	6	4	3	2	4
When new curriculum programs are initiated, I am not consulted or trained.	57	57	59	57	28	29	28	28	9	9	8	9	5	5	4	5
My teaching is limited by the quality of, or lack of, instructional equipment and materials.	48	48	51	48	34	37	34	36	12	10	10	11	5	4	4	5

TABLE 3 (Continued)

	Not a Problem				Moderate Problem				Serious Problem				Critical Problem			
	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81	78	79	80	81
Having to teach special education students in regular classes is a problem.	54	55	51	.47	23	26	29	31	14	12	12	13	8	7	7	8
There is too little teacher input in solving administrative problems.	19	19	22	19	41	43	44	44	24	23	21	22	15	13	12	14
In-service education provided by the district does not meet my needs.	16	18	18	19	27	34	36	34	28	26	25	25	28	21	21	21
TSTAFF (Staff Interpersonal Relationships)																
The support staff in this school is not cooperative.	60	63	64	63	29	28	27	27	8	6	6	7	3	2	3	3
The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together.	58	57	56	55	31	33	34	35	8	7	7	7	2	2	2	3
There is little interaction among teachers in this school, i.e. everyone is doing his/her own thing.	28	28	28	28	45	48	48	48	19	17	17	17	7	6	6	7
DISCPROB (Discipline Problems)																
Too much time is spent on discipline problems.	36	39	40	37	38	39	40	29	17	14	15	15	9	7	6	8
The values held by the students are in conflict with those of the school.	14	13	13	14	44	47	50	48	30	29	27	26	11	10	9	11
Too little support on discipline is provided by administrators.	33	36	44	38	34	35	34	34	19	17	14	17	14	11	8	11
Too little support on discipline is given by parents.	8	7	10	9	30	36	40	39	37	36	34	33	24	20	16	18
Disruption of my class(es) by students is a continuing frustration.	42	41	43	40	36	38	39	39	15	13	13	13	8	7	6	8

Summary

A review of all teacher data indicated high agreement on the problem areas and those conditions perceived as going well in Pennsylvania. It appeared little change has taken place over the four years studied in teacher perceptions of positive or negative areas. It would seem there are areas that merit investigation to define specific problems. This could lead to interventions that would be an attempt to resolve some of the statewide problems noted. Also, specific schools have data reflecting their teacher perceptions. Those data could be used to recognize strengths and weaknesses at the local school level. It was noted intermediate and secondary teachers were more negative in their perceptions than elementary teachers.

URBAN TEACHER RESULTS

Introduction

In 1981 Philadelphia and Pittsburgh city teachers were included in the EQA teacher survey on school conditions for the first time in several years. Urban teachers from areas other than Philadelphia and Pittsburgh were included in the 1978 through 1981 surveys along with the teachers from suburban and rural areas. Thus, the 1981 data provided an opportunity to investigate the question: Do teachers from the two largest Pennsylvania urban areas have perceptions of school conditions that differ from the remainder of the state?

Data for 1981 were presented in Tables 4 (elementary teachers), 5 (intermediate teachers) and 6 (secondary teachers) to illustrate responses for the following three groups: (1) all Pennsylvania teachers, (2) Pennsylvania teachers excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers and (3) only Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers. The three response group percentages were included for all items on each response option.

Urban Elementary Teacher Perceptions

A review of the elementary teacher data in Table 4 revealed rather substantial differences between the response percentages for Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers and the response percentages for Pennsylvania teachers excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers. For example, on the item "My students are chronically absent from school." found in the "factors disruptive to classroom management" area, the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers were much more negative in their perceptions. For most of the items this trend of more negative perceptions was present for the teachers from the two Pennsylvania urban areas.

On a few items the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers were more positive than the other Pennsylvania teachers. Being positive was defined as a higher percentage of urban teachers selecting the "Not a Problem" response than did the teachers across Pennsylvania. Those items with urban teachers being more positive were the following: "The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning." "The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students." and "In-service education provided by the district does not meet my needs."

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS
1981

	Critical Problem			Serious Problem			Moderate Problem			Not A Problem		
	Total[1]	Excl. Phil., Pitt.[2]	Phil. & Pitt.[3]	Total	Excl. Phil., Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil., Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil., Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.
EXTRACT (Activities External to the Classroom)												
There are too few activities which recognize the talent of our students.	2	2	11	12	10	22	41	42	39	43	46	29
There is little emphasis on vocational development.	4	3	13	11	10	23	32	34	26	50	53	38
There is no time or place for students and teachers to interact outside the classroom.	4	3	12	12	10	19	38	38	36	46	49	33
Not enough teachers are involved in helping students overcome problems.	2	2	8	9	7	18	35	35	39	52	56	35
Not enough teachers actively participate in extracurricular activities.	2	2	5	10	10	12	36	37	32	51	51	51
TRELATE (Teacher/Student/Parent Relationships)												
The students in this school aren't really interested in learning.	2	1	7	9	7	22	54	54	52	35	38	19
Too many of my students are indifferent to school.	2	1	9	12	9	24	47	48	44	39	42	22

[1]The "total" column presents Pennsylvania teacher responses in percentages for all teachers. n=10,972

[2]The "Excl. Phil., Pitt." column presents Pennsylvania teacher responses in percentages excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers. n=9,281

[3]The "Phil. & Pitt." column presents Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teacher responses in percentages. n=1,691

TABLE 4 (Continued)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS
1981

	Critical Problem			Serious Problem			Moderate Problem			Not A Problem		
	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.
There is not enough parent-teacher interaction.	5	2	19	14	11	28	42	43	36	39	43	17
Too many parents take little or no interest in their children's school work.	9	7	25	23	22	31	49	52	33	18	19	11
The quality of teacher-parent interaction is not good.	3	2	10	11	8	24	42	44	41	42	46	25
When a problem arises involving a community group, the teachers have little input into the solution.	7	6	15	19	19	26	42	45	35	29	31	24
The parents do not support what the school does.	4	3	11	14	12	24	45	47	36	36	38	29
The parents do not place a high value on education.	6	4	16	16	15	26	46	48	36	31	33	22
Students in this school have poor study habits.	9	6	28	26	24	35	52	56	30	12	14	7
DISRUPT(Factors Disruptive to Classroom Management)												
The different races or ethnic groups don't get along well together.	1	0	2	2	1	6	12	9	30	85	90	62
The achievement levels of my students are too heterogeneous.	4	2	14	12	11	22	44	46	38	38	41	26
Health and nutrition problems seem to affect the learning of my students.	2	1	7	9	7	17	38	38	37	51	53	39
The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning.	1	1	1	3	3	2	11	12	9	84	84	88
The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students.	1	1	1	3	3	3	20	22	13	75	74	83
My students are chronically absent from school.	2	1	6	4	3	11	29	28	38	65	68	45
There are too many outside interruptions during class periods.	6	5	14	11	10	18	38	38	38	45	47	30
I have to spend too much time on non-instructional duties.	8	8	13	15	15	16	38	39	35	38	38	36

TABLE 4 (Continued)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DISTRUBITIONS FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS
1981

	Critical Problem			Serious Problem			Moderate Problem			Not A Problem		
	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.
INFLUENC (Teacher Influence Upon Instructional Decisions)												
Physical facilities of this school limit the kinds of programs provided for students.	8	7	16	12	12	16	31	32	31	48	49	37
I work with too many students each day.	8	7	17	12	12	14	30	30	26	50	51	43
Lack of freedom to teach the way I want to makes me less effective with my students.	2	2	4	5	5	6	19	19	22	72	74	68
Teachers have little control over matters such as textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs.	4	3	12	9	8	14	33	32	35	54	57	39
When new curriculum programs are initiated, I am not consulted or trained.	4	3	11	9	8	18	31	32	32	54	57	39
My teaching is limited by the quality of, or lack of, instructional equipment and materials.	4	2	15	8	6	19	31	30	34	57	62	32
Having to teach special education students in regular classes is a problem.	8	6	20	12	11	18	29	30	24	50	53	38
There is too little teacher input in solving administrative problems.	9	8	14	17	17	18	42	44	39	30	31	29
In-service education provided by the district does not meet my needs.	13	13	12	22	22	17	38	41	29	26	24	42
TSTAFF (Staff Interpersonal Relationships)												
The support staff in this school is not cooperative.	2	1	5	4	3	8	18	17	24	76	79	63
The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together.	2	1	5	4	3	9	22	20	32	72	75	54
There is little interaction among teachers in this school, i.e. everyone is doing his/her own thing.	3	2	10	8	7	16	35	34	40	53	57	34

TABLE 4 (Continued)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS
1981

	Critical Problem			Serious Problem			Moderate Problem			Not A Problem		
	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.
DISCPROB (Discipline Problems)												
Too much time is spent on discipline problems.	9	5	28	14	13	22	37	39	28	40	43	22
The values held by the students are in conflict with those of the school.	5	3	16	13	11	27	41	43	35	40	44	21
Too little support on discipline is provided by administrators.	9	6	24	13	12	20	30	30	26	48	52	30
Too little support on discipline is given by parents.	12	9	28	23	22	29	45	47	30	21	22	13
Disruption of my class(es) by students is a continuing frustration.	8	5	23	12	11	20	36	37	32	44	47	25

Teacher responses on the item "Not enough teachers actively participate in extracurricular activities." were the same (51 percent) for the not a problem option by all three teacher groups.

Since the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers were for the most items more negative, their influence on the total of all Pennsylvania teacher response percentages was examined. The difference between the total Pennsylvania teacher response percentages and Pennsylvania teacher response percentages with Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers excluded was used to answer this question. For most items there was little or no difference in the response percentages for the two groups. Even for the most extreme differences the change in percentage was only 3 or 4 percent. An example of such an item was the following: "Not enough teachers are involved in helping students overcome problems." The not a problem response option was selected by 52 percent of the total teacher group and by 56 percent of the teachers excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers.

As noted previously, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers were more negative on most items. For a total of seven items, 20 percent or more of the teachers indicated the item was a "critical problem." In general terms those items were: parental interest in student's school work, student study habits, teaching special education students in regular classes, spending too much time on discipline, administrator and parental support on discipline and class disruptions.

In summary, the Philadelphia and Pittsubrgh teachers were overall more negative in their perceptions of school conditions. Most of the negative responses were in the general areas of "discipline problems", "teacher influence upon instructional decisions" and "teacher/student/parent relationships". The influence of negative urban teacher perceptions was slight on the percentages for the Pennsylvania teachers. It was evident that teachers across the Commonwealth shared some common problem areas with their urban teacher colleagues, but the urban teachers perceived the problems as being more critical.

Urban Intermediate Teacher Perceptions

Data on Philadelphia and Pittsburgh intermediate teacher perceptions of school conditions were placed in Table 5 along with teacher perceptions on school conditions for all Pennsylvania teachers and for Pennsylvania teachers excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers. The procedures utilized were the same as those employed for elementary urban teachers when Table 4 was compiled.

A review of "Critical Problem" response percentages revealed Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers were more negative than the other teachers across Pennsylvania. An extreme example of the negative responses was found for the item "Students in this school have poor study habits." For the total Pennsylvania teacher group 20 percent selected the "Critical Problem" response, while 41 percent of the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers selected the "Critical Problem" response. This illustrated one of several items with a negative urban teacher response pattern exceeding that of Pennsylvania teachers in general.

An analysis of data from Table 5 found several items with negative intermediate Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teacher responses. The negative teacher responses with 20 percent or more of the responses in the "Critical Problem" option were for the following items: not enough parent/teacher interaction, parental interest

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS
1981

	Critical Problem			Serious Problem			Moderate Problem			Not A Problem		
	Total[1]	Excl. Phil. Pitt.[2]	Phil. & Pitt.[3]	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.
EXTRACT (Activities External to the Classroom)												
There are too few activities which recognize the talent of our students.	5	4	11	16	15	24	38	38	39	41	43	26
There is little emphasis on vocational development.	5	4	11	11	10	22	36	36	34	47	50	33
There is no time or place for students and teachers to interact outside of the classroom.	5	4	11	14	13	21	39	40	35	41	43	33
Not enough teachers are involved in helping students overcome problems.	4	3	10	16	15	22	48	49	42	32	33	26
Not enough teachers actively participate in extracurricular activities.	5	5	5	18	19	15	43	44	39	33	32	41
TRELATE (Teacher/Student/Parent Relationships												
The students in this school aren't really interested in learning.	6	5	14	24	24	30	58	60	45	11	11	11
Too many of my students are indifferent to school.	8	6	19	29	29	30	51	52	40	12	13	11

[1]The "total" column presents Pennsylvania teacher responses in percentages for all teachers. n=8,250

[2]The "Excl. Phil., Pitt." column presents Pennsylvania teacher responses in percentages excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers. n=7,185

[3]The "Phil. & Pitt." column presents Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teacher responses in percentages. n=1,065

TABLE 5 (Continued)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS
1981

	Critical Problem			Serious Problem			Moderate Problem			Not A Problem		
	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.
There is not enough parent-teacher interaction.	10	7	29	25	25	31	46	49	29	18	19	11
Too many parents take little or no interest in their children's school work.	17	18	32	38	39	34	38	40	28	7	7	6
The quality of teacher-parent interaction is not good.	6	4	15	21	20	30	48	52	40	22	24	15
When a problem arises involving a community group, the teachers have little input into the solution.	11	10	17	26	26	30	42	44	35	19	20	18
The parents do not support what the school does.	6	5	14	21	20	28	52	55	37	20	20	21
The parents do not place a high value on education	9	8	18	27	27	30	46	48	36	17	17	16
Students in this school have poor study habits.	20	17	41	41	42	34	35	38	22	3	3	3
DISRUPT (Factors Disruptive to Classroom Management)												
The different races or ethnic groups don't get along well together.	1	1	4	2	1	7	16	13	37	80	85	52
The achievement levels of my students are too heterogeneous.	6	5	13	17	16	26	48	50	41	27	29	20
Health and nutrition problems seem to affect the learning of my students.	2	1	9	8	7	17	39	39	39	51	53	35
The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning.	5	5	1	9	10	5	32	33	22	54	52	72
The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students.	1	1	3	3	3	3	26	27	17	70	69	77
My students are chronically absent from school.	5	4	10	12	11	17	47	48	43	36	37	30
There are too many outside interruptions during class periods.	8	6	18	14	13	20	40	40	38	38	41	24
I have to spend too much time on non-instructional duties.	7	7	12	15	15	16	39	39	34	38	39	38

TABLE 5 (Continued)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS
1981

	Critical Problem			Serious Problem			Moderate Problem			Not A Problem		
	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.
INFLUENC (Teacher Influence Upon Instructional Decisions)												
Physical facilities of this school limit the kinds of programs provided for students.	13	12	16	16	16	17	33	33	33	38	39	34
I work with too many students each day.	9	9	15	13	13	14	33	34	30	44	44	41
Lack of freedom to teach the way I want to makes me less effective with my students.	2	2	4	4	4	6	18	18	22	75	76	68
Teachers have little control over matters such as textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs.	4	3	10	7	6	12	28	27	34	61	64	44
My teaching is limited by the quality of, or lack of, instructional equipment and materials.	5	4	10	11	10	17	33	29	34	56	58	39
When new curriculum programs are initiated, I am not consulted or trained.	6	5	17	9	10	20	29	33	35	50	52	28
Having to teach special education students in regular classes is a problem.	9	8	17	14	14	20	31	32	29	45	46	34
There is too little teacher input in solving administrative problems.	13	12	15	20	20	21	42	44	40	24	24	24
In-service education provided by the district does not meet my needs.	20	21	14	25	26	19	34	35	31	20	18	36
TSTAFF (Staff Interpersonal Relationships)												
The support staff in this school is not cooperative.	3	2	7	6	5	12	24	23	29	67	70	52
The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together.	2	2	6	6	5	12	31	30	36	61	63	46
There is little interaction among teachers in this school, i.e., everyone is doing his/her own thing.	6	5	12	13	12	19	43	44	41	37	39	28

TABLE 5 (Continued)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS
1981

	Critical Problem			Serious Problem			Moderate Problem			Not A Problem		
	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.
DISCPROB (Discipline Problems)												
Too much time is spent on discipline problems.	10	8	30	17	16	25	36	38	24	36	38	21
The values held by the students are in conflict with those of the school.	10	8	23	25	25	30	46	48	33	18	19	14
Too little support on discipline is provided by administrators.	11	10	24	16	15	21	31	32	28	41	43	27
Too little support on discipline is given by the parents.	18	16	31	32	32	32	40	41	28	10	11	9
Disruption of my class(es) by students is a continuing frustration.	10	7	27	15	14	21	39	40	33	37	39	19

in student's school work, student study habits, time spent on discipline, and all of the other items for discipline problems. This list included all but one item on the elementary Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teacher list of negative areas plus several additional items were noted. It was evident a higher pecentage of intermediate urban teachers were responding with the "Critical Problem" option than did urban elementary teachers.

On a more positive note there were items where urban intermediate teachers were more positive than teachers across Pennsylvania. For the following items a higher percentage of urban intermediate teachers selected "Not a Problem" than did all Pennsylvania teachers:"Not enough teachers actively participate in extracurricular activities." "The parents do not support what the school does." "The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning." "The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students." and "In-service education provided by the district does not meet my needs."

As was the case with urban elementary teachers, the urban secondary teachers responses did not alter the state data by more than 3 or 4 percent. This was mainly due to the number of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers compared to the number of Pennsylvania teachers in total. Hence, the urban teacher influence was limited when the state percentages were calculated.

Overall the intermediate teachers were for Philadelphia and Pittsburgh more negative than their Pennsylvania teacher colleagues. Also, the urban intermediate teachers were more negative than the urban elementary teachers. An examination of the most severe problems revealed a great amount of similarity between urban teachers and all Pennsylvania teachers, and between urban elementary and urban intermediate teachers.

Urban Secondary Teacher Perceptions

Secondary urban teacher data were placed in Table 6 along with Pennsylvania teacher perceptions and Pennsylvania teachers excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers.

Secondary and intermediate teachers from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh shared many of the same perceptions of school conditions. The most positive secondary teacher responses, based on the percentage of teachers selecting "Not a Problem" were for items on: competition for grades putting pressure on students, lack of freedom in selecting instructional strategies, support staff cooperation, and teachers working well together. These items were often selected by urban teachers and by teachers across Pennsylvania.

The most negative secondary teacher responses were on: student indifference to school, parental interest in student's school work, parent/teacher interaction, teacher input into resolving community problems, student study habits, student absenteeism, time on discipline problems, student values conflicting with those of the school, parental support on discipline and class disruptions. These items were under the general school condition areas of "teacher/student/parent relationships", "factors disruptive to classroom management" and "discipline problems."

Due to the number of teachers included from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh they were of little influence on the percentages recorded for the total Pennsylvania teacher responses. This finding was congruent with the findings for intermediate and elementary teachers.

TABLE 6

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR SECONDARY TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS
1981

	Critical Problem			Serious Problem			Moderate Problem			Not A Problem		
	Total[1]	Excl. Phil, Pitt.[2]	Phil. & Pitt.[3]	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.
EXTRACT (Activities External to the Classroom)												
There are too few activities which recognize the talent of our students	4	4	8	14	13	17	36	36	38	45	47	37
There is little emphasis on vocational development.	3	3	6	9	8	15	32	32	32	56	57	47
There is no time or place for students and teachers to interact outside of the classroom.	6	4	14	15	14	23	41	42	34	39	40	29
Not enough teachers are involved in helping students overcome problems.	4	3	8	18	17	25	51	52	44	27	28	23
Not enough teachers actively participate in extracurricular activities.	7	6	9	22	22	22	43	44	40	28	28	29
TRELATE (Teacher/Student/Parent Relationships)												
The students in this school aren't really interested in learning.	7	5	15	28	28	36	57	59	44	8	8	5
Too many of my students are indifferent to school.	9	7	21	33	32	41	48	50	33	10	11	5
There is not enough parent-teacher interaction.	11	9	26	29	28	36	45	48	29	14	15	9
Too many parents take little or no interest in their children's school work.	18	16	34	39	39	41	37	39	21	5	6	4
The quality of teacher-parent interaction is not good.	7	6	18	23	23	30	50	52	39	18	19	13

[1]The "total" column presents Pennsylvania teacher responses in percentages for all teachers. n=9,026

[2]The "Excl. Phil., Pitt." column presents Pennsylvania teacher responses in percentages excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers. n=7,925

[3]The "Phil. & Pitt" column presents Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teacher responses in percentages. n=1,101

TABLE 6 (Continued)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR SECONDARY TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS
1981

	Critical Problem			Serious Problem			Moderate Problem			Not A Problem		
	Total	Excl. Phil, Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.
When a problem arises involving a community group, the teachers have little input into the solution.	13	12	21	28	28	32	41	43	33	16	17	14
The parents do not support what the school does.	7	6	15	23	23	30	51	53	38	18	18	17
The parents do not place a high value on education.	10	10	18	29	28	35	45	47	36	15	15	11
Students in this school have poor study habits.	22	19	45	42	43	38	33	35	16	3	3	1
DISRUPT (Factors Disruptive to Classroom Management)												
The different races or ethnic groups don't get along well together.	1	1	5	3	2	10	18	16	41	76	81	44
The achievement levels of my students are too heterogeneous.	6	5	13	20	19	32	51	53	41	21	23	14
Health and nutrition problems seem to affect the learning of my students.	2	1	9	8	6	18	37	37	41	52	56	32
The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning.	8	8	9	13	13	15	39	39	39	40	40	37
The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students.	2	1	3	5	5	4	31	33	19	62	61	74
My students are chronically absent from school.	11	8	31	20	18	29	47	50	34	22	24	6
There are too many outside interruptions during class periods.	10	9	14	15	15	17	43	44	41	31	32	28
I have to spend too much time on non-instructional duties.	9	8	16	17	17	19	41	42	33	33	33	32
INFLUENC (Teacher Influence Upon Instructional Decisions)												
Physical facilities of this school limit the kinds of progress provided for students.	10	10	11	16	16	17	34	34	36	39	40	36
I work with too many students each day.	7	7	11	12	12	11	33	34	30	47	47	48
Lack of freedom to teach the way I want to makes me less effective with my students.	2	2	4	4	3	6	17	17	20	77	78	70

TABLE 6 (Continued)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR SECONDARY TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS
1981

	Critical Problem			Serious Problem			Moderate Problem			Not A Problem		
	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.	Total	Excl. Phil. Pitt.	Phil. & Pitt.
Teachers have little control over matters such as textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs.	4	3	9	6	5	13	26	25	33	64	67	45
When new curriculum programs are initiated, I am not consulted or trained.	5	4	10	9	8	18	28	28	32	57	60	40
My teaching is limited by the quality of, or lack of, instructional equipment and materials.	5	5	10	11	10	17	36	35	38	48	50	35
Having to teach special education students in regular classes is a problem.	8	6	17	13	13	21	31	31	31	47	50	31
There is too little teacher input in solving administrative problems.	14	13	18	22	23	23	44	45	39	19	19	20
In-service education provided by the district does not meet my needs.	21	22	17	25	26	19	34	35	30	19	17	34
TSTAFF (Staff Interpersonal Relationships)												
The support staff in this school in not cooperative.	3	2	7	7	6	11	27	27	32	63	65	50
The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together.	3	3	5	7	7	8	35	35	34	55	55	53
There is little interaction among teachers in this school, i.e., everyone is doing his/her own thing.	7	7	12	17	16	20	48	49	42	28	28	26
DISCPROB (Discipline Problems)												
Too much time is spent on discipline problems.	8	6	21	15	14	23	29	40	33	37	40	23
The values held by the students are in conflict with those of the school.	11	9	23	26	26	33	48	50	36	14	15	8
Too little support on discipline is provided by administrators.	11	10	16	17	17	20	34	35	34	38	38	30
Too little support on discipline is given by parents.	18	17	29	33	33	33	39	40	31	9	10	7
Disruption of my class(es) by students is a continuing frustration.	8	7	20	13	12	19	39	39	37	40	42	24

For secondary urban teachers the responses were rather negative when compared to urban elementary teachers or to most Pennsylvania teachers. Based on these data it would appear that teachers from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh perceive the school conditions in more negative terms. It was noted secondary urban teachers did for a few items have more positive perceptions.

Summary

As stated previously Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers perceived the school problems as being more critical than did their teacher colleagues from other Pennsylvania school districts. Some of the perceived urban school problems were: teacher/student/parent relationships, factors disruptive to classroom management and discipline problems. Urban teachers noted some of the most severe problems in relationships with parents and students but not with teacher colleagues. In fact, teachers from the urban areas were rather positive concerning teacher in-service programs and the competition for grades pressuring students.

RESULTS USING CONTROL VARIABLES

Introduction

Analysis of variance was used to analyze teacher perceptions of school conditions based on selected control variables. The control variables were the following: socio-economic status, student preception of parental interest, population density, years of teaching experience, teacher education level, class size and hiring practices. All of the analysis of variance calculations were made separately for the three teacher groups: elementary, intermediate and secondary. Where significant differences were found using the analysis of variance technique, the Duncan multiple range test was utilized to determine significant group contrasts.

Analysis for Hiring Practices

Results of the analysis of variance using hiring practice groups were placed in Table 7 for elementary teachers, Table 8 for intermediate teachers and Table 9 for secondary teachers. Hiring practice groups were indicators of the administrative tendency to employ individuals that were from the local area or individuals from outside the local area. Insiders were defined in this study as individuals graduating from high school in or within thirty miles of the employer school district boundaries. Outsiders were considered to be individuals who graduated from high school more than thirty miles but less than 100 miles from the employer school district boundaries. Distant outsiders were individuals graduating from high school more than 100 miles from the employer school district boundaries.

Elementary teacher results were statistically significant for several school condition areas including: teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents, teacher/student/parent relationships, factors disruptive to classroom management, teacher influence upon instructional decisions and discipline problems. The outsider group means were the highest reflecting more positive perceptions of school conditions. However, the difference between group means was rather small for elementary teachers.

TABLE 7

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY HIRING PRACTICE GROUPS DURING 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	HIRING PRACTICE GROUPS: DISTANT OUTSIDER MEAN	OUTSIDER MEAN	INSIDER MEAN	F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	2.19	2.23	2.17	5.16	
Activities external to the classroom	11.55	11.72	11.56	2.46	
Teacher/student/parent relationships	18.70	19.03	18.25	18.28	2>3; 1,2>3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	19.82	19.92	19.65	6.88	1,2>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.22	20.46	20.03	5.84	
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.72	7.80	7.72	1.76	
Discipline problems	10.58	10.80	10.21	23.50	1>3; 2>3; 1,2>3
n	2100	1780	7022		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was the "distant outsiders", group two was the "outsiders" and group three was the "insiders".

TABLE 8

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY HIRING PRACTICE GROUPS DURING 1961

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	DISTANT OUTSIDER MEAN	OUTSIDER MEAN	INSIDER MEAN	F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.83	1.88	1.89	4.40	
Activities external to the classroom	10.76	10.75	10.69	0.44	
Teacher/student/parent relationships	14.76	15.19	14.85	3.22	
Factors disruptive to classroom management	18.34	18.43	18.42	0.44	
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	19.41	19.48	19.22	2.32	
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.25	7.21	7.15	1.90	
Discipline problems	9.15	9.44	9.14	4.32	
n	1932	1630	4840		

[1] F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2] Contrasts between groups were not examined, since none of the F-ratios was statistically significant. Group one was the "distant outsiders", group two was the "outsiders" and group three was the "insiders".

TABLE 9

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SECONDARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY HIRING PRACTICE GROUPS DURING 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	HIRING PRACTICE GROUPS: DISTANT OUTSIDER MEAN	OUTSIDER MEAN	INSIDER MEAN	F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.81	1.86	1.84	1.64	
Activities external to the classroom	10.75	10.66	10.64	1.08	
Teacher/student/parent relationships	15.23	14.45	14.08	3.58	
Factors disruptive to classroom management	17.47	17.64	17.39	3.50	
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	19.81	19.58	19.35	7.18	1>3
Staff interpersonal relationships	6.93	6.86	6.88	0.74	
Discipline problems	9.46	9.34	9.11	8.40	1>3; 1,2>3
n	1936	1856	3184		

[1] F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2] Contrasts between groups were not examined, since none of the F-ratios was statistically significant. Group one was the "distant outsiders", group two was the "outsiders" and group three was the "insiders".

None of the analyses for intermediate teacher groups displayed significant differences for the school conditions. These data were summarized in Table 8.

Secondary teacher results were significant for two school condition areas: teacher influence upon instructional decisions and discipline problems. For secondary teachers the distant outsider teacher means were highest for the significant areas. Thus, distant outsiders had significantly more positive perceptions.

Overall the analysis of hiring practice groups was not conclusive. There was a slight trend for outsiders at the elementary level and distant outsiders for some secondary teacher perceptions to be more positive. The differences between the group means were small in every case.

Analysis of Class Size

Analysis of mean class size as a control variable was placed in Tables 10, 11 and 12 for elementary, intermediate and secondary teachers. Class size was measured by an item posed to teachers asking their mean class size excluding supervisory duties such as study halls. Analysis of variance was employed to determine statistically significant differences.

Results for elementary, intermediate and secondary teachers were significant for every school condition area. Hence, mean class size was statistically linked to the teacher perceptions of school conditions. Group means and group contrasts revealed much more positive attitudes by teachers with smaller classes.

The elementary teacher analysis had F-ratios which were greater than the intermediate or secondary teacher analysis. Overall, elementary teachers in the "twenty-one to twenty-five" class size group perceived school conditions in a more positive manner, for all but two areas, than the teachers in any of the other three class size groups including the "twenty or fewer" group. The teachers in the twenty or fewer group had the most positive attitude on two areas which included discipline problems. As might be exppeted the teachers in the over thirty class size group had the most negative perceptions, especially in the areas of discipline problems.

Intermediate teachers were most positive in the twenty or fewer and twenty-one to twenty-five class size groups. The twenty or fewer class size group had the highest mean score only on perceptions of teacher influence upon instructional decisions. The intermediate teachers in the twenty-one to twenty-five class size group had the most positive mean scores on all other school conditions.

Secondary teacher means for the twenty or fewer group were the most positive for several general areas including: teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents, teacher/student/parent relationships, factors disruptive to classroom management, teacher influence upon instructional decisions and discipline problems. Thus, for the secondary teachers the twenty or fewer class size group reflected more positive perceptions. Differences between group means were not as large as those found for the elementary teachers.

In total, it was evident that mean class size had a significant relationship with teacher perceptions of school conditions. Those teachers with small classes

TABLE 10

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY CLASS SIZE GROUPS DURING 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	CLASS SIZE GROUPS: 20 or FEWER	21 to 25	26 to 30	OVER 30	F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	2.20	2.28	2.17	1.89	87.74	1<2; 1>4; 2>3; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Activities external to the classroom	11.66	11.94	11.60	10.18	128.66	1<2; 1>4; 2>3; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Teacher / student / parent relationship	18.78	19.39	18.27	15.53	175.88	1<2; 1>4; 2>3; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Factors disruptive to classroom management	20.09	20.15	19.55	18.20	147.86	1>3; 1>4; 2>3; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	21.29	20.76	19.55	17.45	219.84	1>2; 1>3; 1>4; 2>3; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.82	7.92	7.75	6.95	112.84	1>4; 2>3; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Discipline problems	11.02	10.91	10.09	8.18	218.90	1>3; 1>4; 2>3; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
n	2220	4052	3314	1192		

[1] F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 3.90 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2] Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "20 or fewer", group two was "21 to 25", group three was "25 to 30" and group four was "over 30".

TABLE 11

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY CLASS SIZE GROUPS DURING 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	CLASS SIZE GROUPS: 20 or FEWER	21 to 25	26 to 30	OVER 30	F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.88	1.93	1.90	1.72	18.86	1>4; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Activities external to the classroom	10.68	11.05	10.85	9.78	52.08	1<2; 1>4; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Teacher/ student/ parent relationship	15.01	15.30	15.04	13.54	29.60	1>4; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Factors disruptive to classroom management	18.56	18.61	18.43	17.57	26.96	1>4; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.27	19.88	19.01	17.02	131.84	1>3; 1>4; 2>3; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.18	7.32	7.25	6.74	26.50	1>4; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Discipline problems	9.48	9.51	9.20	8.06	47.46	1>4; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
n	2110	2276	2632	1112		

[1] F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 3.90 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2] Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "20 or fewer", group two was "21 to 25", group three was "25 to 30" and group four was "over 30".

TABLE 12

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SECONDARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY CLASS SIZE GROUPS DURING 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	CLASS SIZE GROUPS: 20 or FEWER	21 to 25	26 to 30	OVER 30	F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.87	1.87	1.79	1.73	10.72	1>4; 2>4; 1,2, 3>4; 1,2>3,4
Activities external to the classroom	10.69	10.79	10.70	10.19	11.36	1>4; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Teacher / student / parent relationship	14.48	14.44	13.94	13.19	18.36	1>3; 1>4; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Factors disruptive to classroom management	17.82	17.59	17.22	16.65	30.96	1>3; 1>4; 2>3; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.60	19.88	18.66	17.64	136.20	1>2; 1>3; 1>4; 2>3; 2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3,>4; 1,2>3,4
Staff interpersonal relationships	6.96	6.98	6.86	6.49	18.06	2>4; 3>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
Discipline problems	9.46	9.44	8.97	8.62	22.40	1>3; 1>4; 2>3; 2>4; 1,2,3>4; 1,2>3,4
n	2466	2948	2546	938		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 3.90 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.
Group one was "20 or fewer", group two was "21 to 25", group three was "25 to 30", and group four was "over 30."

were more positive in their perceptions of school conditions. The greatest differences were found between elementary teachers on the class size groups. The findings in the present study were congruent with the results of Smith and Glass (1979) revealing small class size was associated with greater teacher satisfaction. Other studies reported similar findings including McCaskill's (1979) work indicating as class size and total student load increased teacher work satisfaction decreased. These studies along with others (Holdaway 1978) support the negative statistical relationship between higher class size and teacher perceptions.

Analysis of Teacher Education Level

Analysis of variance results for elementary, intermediate and secondary teacher education level groups were placed in Tables 13, 14 and 15. Three teacher groups were formed: those with a Bachelor's or less were one group, with a Master's or Master's equivalency were a second group and with a Master's plus one year or more of graduate work were the third group. The information on teacher education level was gathered from teachers as a part of the EQA teacher questionnaire.

F-ratios were statistically significant for elementary teacher groups on all of the school condition areas, but most of the F-ratios were rather low. The teachers in the Bachelor's or less group were the most positive on six of the seven areas. Although the group means on each of the school condition areas varied only slightly.

Most of the results were not statistically significant for intermediate and secondary teachers. Those results that were significant indicated teachers with the lowest education level were the most positive.

It appeared the teacher education level did not make much of a difference in the teacher perceptions of school conditions. For the significant areas lower education level teachers had slightly more positive perceptions.

Analysis of Teacher Experience

Teachers reported on the EQA survey the number of years they had worked as a teacher. Using the teacher years of experience data, groups were formed of two or less, three to eight, nine to fifteen and sixteen or more years of teacher experience.

The analysis of variance results for elementary teachers, found in Table 16, were significant for all school condition areas. The least experienced and most experienced teachers had the most positive perceptions. F-ratios were high for several areas, and the difference between group means was considerable on those areas. It appeared the positive attitude of youth was evident in the results. Also, one could hypothesize that those teachers remaining in the education profession were the ones with more positive perceptions, or that teachers became positive in their perceptions with more years of experience. Thus, the teachers with more years of experience perceived the school conditions in positive terms.

Intermediate teacher results, found in Table 17, were not as dramatic as those of the elementary teachers. The F-ratios were lower for intermediate than those of the elementary teachers. Where significant differences were found the less

TABLE 13

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY TEACHER EDUCATION LEVEL GROUPS DURING 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	TEACHER EDUCATION LEVEL			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	BACHELOR'S OR LESS	MASTER'S OR EQUIVALENCY	MASTER'S PLUS 1 YEAR OR GREATER		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	2.20	2.15	2.21	7.32	
Activities external to the classroom	11.66	11.54	11.42	5.44	
Teacher / student / parent relationship	18.65	18.24	18.41	6.56	
Factors disruptive to classroom management	19.93	19.56	19.54	20.86	1>2; 1>3; 1>2,3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.42	19.87	19.90	16.86	1>2; 1>3; 1>2,3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.84	7.66	7.38	21.84	1>2; 1>3; 1>2,3; 1,2>3
Discipline problems	10.52	10.25	10.22	8.32	1>2,3
n	5088	3992	1752		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.
Group one was "Bachelor's or less", group two was "Master's or equivalency", group three was "Master's plus one year or greater".

TABLE 14

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY TEACHER EDUCATION LEVEL GROUPS DURING 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	TEACHER EDUCATION LEVEL			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	BACHELOR'S OR LESS	MASTER'S OR EQUIVALENCY	MASTER'S PLUS 1 YEAR OR GREATER		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.87	1.88	1.90	0.62	
Activities external to the classroom	10.72	10.80	10.61	2.38	
Teacher / student / parent relationship	14.90	14.91	14.89	0.00	
Factors disruptive to classroom management	18.45	18.45	18.23	2.98	
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	19.45	19.35	18.98	5.88	
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.24	7.24	6.97	14.60	1>3; 2>3; 1,2>3
Discipline problems	9.20	9.28	9.10	1.42	
n	3598	2808	1770		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.
Group one was "Bachelor's or less", group two was "Master's or equivalency", group three was "Master's plus one year or greater".

TABLE 15

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SECONDARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY TEACHER EDUCATION LEVEL GROUPS DURING 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	TEACHER EDUCATION LEVEL			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	BACHELOR'S OR LESS	MASTER'S OR EQUIVALENCY	MASTER'S PLUS 1 YEAR OR GREATER		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.84	1.82	1.84	0.54	
Activities external to the classroom	10.75	10.59	10.66	2.98	
Teacher / student / parent relationship	14.32	13.99	14.24	3.52	
Factors disruptive to classroom management	17.77	17.40	17.06	29.56	1>2; 1>3; 1>2,3; 1,2>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	19.72	19.38	19.35	6.04	
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.05	6.78	6.77	21.38	1>2; 1>3; 1>2,3
Discipline problems	9.17	9.30	9.26	1.20	
n	3544	3048	2336		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.
Group one was "Bachelor's or less", group two was "Master's or equivalency", group three was "Master's plus one year or greater".

experienced (two years or less) and the most experienced teachers were the most positive.

Analysis of variance results for secondary teachers were statistically significant for all school condition areas. An examination of the results revealed the least experienced and most experienced teachers as having the most positive perceptions. The secondary teacher results were placed in Table 18.

For all teachers (elementary, secondary and intermediate) it was evident that the least experienced and most experienced teachers had the most positive perceptions. Differences between group means were most dramatic for elementary teachers and on the teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents area.

Research was reviewed that dealt with the issue of teacher years of experience and teacher perceptions. A study by Newman (1979) indicated teachers, as they matured, achieved a more positive rapport with students, and that teachers became more flexible in dealing with students. Newman gathered data by interviewing teachers with twenty to thirty years of experience. A study by Crisp (1968) revealed English teachers with more years of teaching experience perceived they had a better knowledge of their subject area. It was evident that a considerable amount of research on teacher experience has been conducted, but not as much information was found on the relationship with perceptions of school conditions.

Analysis of Population Density

Population density data were gathered for the schools participating in the state assessment program. These data were used to form rural, suburban and urban teacher groups. The analysis of variance results on population density groups were placed in Table 19 for elementary teachers, Table 20 for intermediate teachers and Table 21 for secondary teachers.

The results were consistent for all three teacher groups (elementary, intermediate and secondary). Suburban teachers were significantly more positive for all elementary and intermediate teachers perceptions, and in five of the seven school condition areas for secondary teachers. Secondary rural teachers were most positive only on factors disruptive to classroom management and staff interpersonal relationships. It was noted urban elementary, intermediate and secondary teachers had the lowest mean scores for every school condition area. Many of the group contrasts were found to be statistically significant supporting the previous statement on which teacher groups were most positive.

In total, the suburban teachers had the most positive perceptions of school conditions. Urban teachers had negative perceptions of school conditions. The analysis of variance results were highly significant with elementary teachers having some of the greatest differences between means.

A study of rural teachers in California (Muse, 1979) found they perceived the school as offering more individual attention, better discipline and closer teacher-student relationships. The same group of teachers felt some of the problems were lack of parental support, educational goals, motivation and in-service programs.

TABLE 16

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY TEACHER YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS DURING 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE: 2 or LESS	3 to 8	9 to 15	16 or MORE	F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	2.18	2.09	2.13	2.38	91.48	1<4; 2<4; 3<4; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
Activities external to the classroom	11.62	11.43	11.55	11.78	8.44	2<4; 2,3<4
Teacher/ student/ parent relationships	19.28	17.81	18.12	19.59	70.72	1>2; 1>3; 2<4; 3<4; 1>2,3; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	20.33	19.47	19.60	20.13	33.48	1>2; 1>3; 2<4; 3<4; 1>2,3; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	21.26	19.72	19.72	21.06	65.10	1>2; 1>3; 2<4; 3<4; 1>2,3; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.90	7.63	7.65	7.94	24.76	2<4; 3<4; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
Discipline problems	10.84	10.02	10.17	11.01	47.46	1>2; 1>3; 2<4; 3<4; 1>2,3; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
n	486	3274	4244	2860		

[1] F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 3.90 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2] Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "2 or less", group two was "3 to 8", group three was "9 to 15" and group four was "16 or more".

TABLE 17

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY TEACHER YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS DURING 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE: 2 or LESS	3 to 8	9 to 15	16 or MORE	F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.90	1.79	1.84	2.00	29.78	2<4; 3<4; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
Activities external to the classroom	10.94	10.73	10.70	10.68	1.08	
Teacher / student / parent relationships	15.60	14.44	14.70	15.43	17.64	1>2; 2<4; 3<4; 1>2,3; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	18.82	18.32	18.40	18.41	2.82	
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.02	18.97	18.97	19.88	23.80	1>2; 1>3; 2<4; 3<4; 1>2,3; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.50	7.04	7.15	7.29	11.76	1>2; 1>3; 2<4; 1>2,3; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
Discipline problems	8.97	8.78	9.26	9.55	18.92	2<3; 2<4; 2,3<4
n	454	2234	2956	2514		

[1] F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 3.90 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2] Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "2 or less", group two was "3 to 8", group three was "9 to 15" and group four was "16 or more".

TABLE 18

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SECONDARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY TEACHER YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS DURING 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE: 2 or LESS	3 to 8	9 to 15	16 or MORE	F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.81	1.71	1.75	1.98	64.36	1<4; 2<4; 3<4; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
Activities external to the classroom	11.28	10.68	10.66	10.60	6.90	1>2; 1>3; 1>4; 1>2,3
Teacher / student / parent relationships	14.93	13.78	13.73	14.75	28.56	1>2; 1>3; 2<4; 3<4; 1,4>2,3; 1>2,3; 2,3<4
Factors disruptive to classroom management	18.02	17.52	17.31	17.48	5.36	1>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	19.91	19.47	18.97	19.91	23.58	1>3; 2>3; 3<4; 2,3<4; 1,4>2,3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.38	6.88	6.79	6.92	12.04	1>2; 1>3; 1>4; 1>2,3; 1,4>2,3
Discipline problems	8.90	8.99	9.06	9.56	17.50	2<4; 3<4; 2,3<4
n	386	1962	3180	3400		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 3.90 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "2 or less", group two was "3 to 8", group three was "9 to 15" and group four was "16 or more".

TABLE 19

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY POPULATION DENSITY CATEGORIES IN 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	POPULATION DENSITY			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	2.22	2.35	1.87	311.69	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Activities external to the classroom	11.68	12.28	10.51	290.93	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher/ student/ parent relationships	18.65	20.66	15.25	811.68	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	19.95	20.44	18.43	334.63	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.27	21.19	18.58	211.36	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.81	8.01	7.15	203.63	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Discipline problems	10.78	11.31	8.19	653.27	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
n	5563	2913	2463		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "rural", group two was "suburban" and group three was "urban".

TABLE 20

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY POPULATION DENSITY CATEGORIES IN 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	POPULATION DENSITY			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.91	2.04	1.61	148.05	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Activities external to the classroom	10.63	11.37	9.92	127.12	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher/ student/ parent relationships	14.70	16.41	12.95	215.24	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	18.56	18.88	17.45	90.63	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	19.29	20.14	18.90	87.03	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.20	7.43	6.71	70.77	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Discipline problems	9.42	9.79	7.56	209.17	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
n	4210	2498	1515		

[1]F-rations that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "rural", group two was "suburban" and group three was "urban".

TABLE 21

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SECONDARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY POPULATION DENSITY CATEGORIES IN 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	POPULATION DENSITY			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.87	1.94	1.52	143.97	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Activities external to the classroom	10.58	11.10	10.21	61.11	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher /student/ parent relationships	14.12	15.26	12.14	186.21	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	17.74	17.62	15.90	163.22	2>3; 1>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	19.44	20.01	18.48	54.59	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.02	6.87	6.63	24.55	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Discipline problems	9.44	9.60	7.80	159.77	1<2; 2>3; 1>3
n	4314	3231	1443		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "rural", group two was "suburban" and group three was "urban".

Analysis of Parental Interest in School

A series of three items were included on the student portion of the EQA survey to determine student perceptions of parental interest in school. This information was used to categorize schools into three groups. The groups were formed for schools where students perceived their parents as having "high interest", "some interest" or "little interest." Results were placed in Tables 22, 23 and 24.

All of the analysis of variance results were statistically significant for elementary, intermediate and secondary teachers. In every case the teachers were most positive in schools where the students perceived their parents as highly interested in school. Teachers were the most negative in schools where the students perceived their parents as only having little interest in school. Most of the differences between group means were large and significant group contrasts were found.

It appeared students with the perception that their parents were interested in school were located in schools where teachers were more positive in their perceptions of school conditions. It could be suggested that having high parental interest in school could provide more positive school conditions for teachers.

Analysis of Teacher Expectations

Students responded to an item on their perception of the teacher expectations. The responses presented to students were: one of the best students in the class, above average in the class, at least an average student, or a below average student. The most positive response was assigned the highest score of "three." The responses were assigned lower scores as response options became negative. Data were collected from students at grades eight and eleven only. Thus, the results were available for intermediate and secondary teachers only. Teacher groups were formed for those schools with "high expectations", "average expectations" and "low expectations" as perceived by students.

All of the secondary teacher analysis of variance results were statistically significant, and six of the seven F-ratios were significant for intermediate teachers. It was observed that several of the F-ratios were rather low and that the differences between group means were small. A review of Tables 25 and 26 found the teacher "average expectations" group was most often positive.

Possibly those teachers with very high or low expectations were in conflict with the school and students. This may have decreased slightly the positive teacher perceptions of the school conditions. In any event the group means were significantly different but in most instances the differences between means were not large.

Analysis of Socio-Economic Status

Socio-economic indicators were incorporated into the state assessment program by having students report their parental education and occupation levels. The socio-economic results were utilized to produce high, middle and low socio-economic groups. Analysis of variance results for elementary, intermediate and secondary teachers were placed in Tables 27, 28 and 29.

TABLE 22

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY PARENTAL INTEREST IN SCHOOL GROUPS IN 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	PARENTAL INTEREST IN SCHOOL			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	HIGH INTEREST	SOME INTEREST	LITTLE INTEREST		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	2.22	1.90	1.86	124.83	1>3; 1>3
Activities external to the classroom	11.74	10.55	10.12	138.45	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher/ student/ parent relationships	18.90	15.55	14.39	309.76	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	19.91	18.72	18.23	117.26	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.41	18.61	17.28	129.12	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.81	7.13	6.95	120.12	1>3; 1>3
Discipline problems	10.66	8.48	7.26	314.15	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
n	9483	1168	288		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "High Interest", group two was "Some Interest" and group three was "Little Interest".

TABLE 23

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY PARENTAL INTEREST IN SCHOOL GROUPS IN 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	PARENTAL INTEREST IN SCHOOL			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	HIGH INTEREST	SOME INTEREST	LITTLE INTEREST		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	2.10	1.89	1.71	157.57	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Activities external to the classroom	11.55	10.71	9.96	201.75	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher/ student /parent relationships	17.39	14.63	12.89	518.46	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	19.39	18.38	17.67	172.99	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.72	19.18	18.22	182.43	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.56	7.23	6.77	116.85	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Discipline problems	10.64	9.03	8.02	376.02	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
n	2443	3148	2632		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "High Interest", group two was "Some Interest", and group three was "Little Interest".

TABLE 24

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SECONDARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY PARENTAL INTEREST IN SCHOOL GROUPS IN 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	PARENTAL INTEREST IN SCHOOL			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	HIGH INTEREST	SOME INTEREST	LITTLE INTEREST		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	2.09	1.90	1.69	161.48	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Activities external to the classroom	11.68	10.88	10.18	185.33	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher/ student /parent relationships	17.20	14.74	12.60	518.49	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	18.22	17.59	16.92	87.16	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.98	19.84	18.61	168.79	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.29	7.06	6.61	97.28	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Discipline problems	10.65	9.59	8.38	301.65	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
n	1580	3388	4020		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "High Interest", group two was "Some Interest", and group three was "Little Interest".

TABLE 25

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY STUDENT PERCEPTION OF TEACHER EXPECTAION GROUPS IN 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	TEACHER EXPECTATIONS			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	HIGH EXPECTATIONS	AVERAGE EXPECTATIONS	LOW EXPECTATIONS		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.81	1.95	1.90	19.77	1<2; 2>3; 1<3
Activities external to the classroom	10.41	10.85	10.83	18.59	1<3; 1<2
Teacher/ student /parent relationships	14.56	15.27	14.72	14.36	1<2; 3<2
Factors disruptive to classroom management	17.99	18.64	18.62	30.29	1<2; 1<3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	19.10	19.43	19.41	3.56	
Staff interpersonal relationships	6.99	7.27	7.23	16.30	1<2; 1<3
Discipline problems	8.59	9.39	9.46	46.06	1<2; 1<3
n	2312	3281	2630		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "High Expectations", group two was "Average Expectations", group three was "Low Expectations".

TABLE 26

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SECONDARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY STUDENT PERCEPTION OF TEACHER EXPECTATION GROUPS IN 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	TEACHER EXPECTATIONS			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	HIGH EXPECTATIONS	AVERAGE EXPECTATIONS	LOW EXPECTATIONS		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	1.74	1.92	1.79	37.64	1<2; 1<3; 2>3
Activities external to the classroom	10.48	10.76	10.83	11.03	1<2; 1<3
Teacher/ student /parent relationships	13.78	14.56	14.03	17.81	1<2; 3<2
Factors disruptive to classroom management	16.55	17.66	17.71	87.20	1<2; 1<3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	18.88	19.76	19.57	26.06	1<2; 1<3
Staff interpersonal relationships	6.58	7.08	6.90	51.51	1<2; 1>3; 2>3
Discipline problems	8.63	9.56	9.22	54.32	1<2; 2>3; 1<3
n	2180	4130	2678		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was "High Expectations", group two was "Average Expectations", group three was "Low Expectations".

All of the analysis of variance results were statistically significant for elementary, intermediate and secondary teachers. A trend was clearly identified with those teachers in the "high" socio-economic group having the most positive attitudes. It was noted that many of the F-ratios were high values especially for the area of teacher/student/parent relationships. All of the group contrasts were statistically significant emphasizing the magnitude of the difference between the means. The low socio-economic group had the least positive perception of school conditions.

Overall, it was evident teachers were more positive in high socio-economic settings. Elementary teachers emphasized the influence of the socio-economic status in a greater difference between group means for most school condition areas. Based on these findings, the importance of the socio-economic status was rather high for Pennsylvania teachers.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The analysis of the teacher data for 1978 through 1981 revealed several positive teacher perceptions and a few negative teacher perceptions. Some of the most positive Pennsylvania teacher perceptions were for the following items: race or ethnic group relations, freedom to select teaching strategies, teacher control over textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs and support staff cooperation. Pennsylvania teachers perceived parental interest in student's work, teacher input into solving administrative problems, in-service education not meeting teacher needs and parental support on discipline as the most negative items. It appeared elementary, intermediate and secondary teachers were in general agreement when selecting both positive and negative areas. Although, the elementary teachers were not as negative as the intermediate and secondary teachers.

It appeared little change has taken place over the four years examined in the teacher perceptions of Pennsylvania school conditions. None of the items was found to have more than a 4 percent change in the teachers selecting a response option. Therefore, teachers were emphasizing the same items and were consistent in their responses over the years studied.

An analysis of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teacher perceptions revealed this group of teachers was more critical than their Pennsylvania colleagues. Urban teacher perceptions were not negative on all items. In fact several positive responses were noted including: the emphasis on athletics disrupting classroom learning, the competition for grades putting pressure on students and teacher in-service meeting their needs. The negative influence of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teacher perceptions on the total percentages for all Pennsylvania teachers was slight. Thus, the state data were not substantively altered by having the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh teachers included or excluded when the state sample was selected.

The analysis of variance results for selected variables provided insight into the teacher demographic and school influences on teacher perceptions. Class size had an inverse relationship with positive teacher perceptions that was rather strong. Population density had a strong relationship with teacher perceptions.

TABLE 27

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CATEGORIES IN 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	HIGH	MIDDLE	LOW		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	2.36	2.21	1.94	336.82	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Activities external to the classroom	12.24	11.65	10.78	275.54	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher/student/parent relationships	20.77	18.40	15.92	922.13	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	20.47	19.87	18.83	290.24	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.88	20.38	19.10	141.04	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.95	7.75	7.44	89.94	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Discipline problems	11.47	10.44	9.04	460.25	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
n	3886	3435	3618		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was the "High", group two was the "Middle", and group three was the "Low" socio-economic status category.

TABLE 28

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INTERMEDIATE TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CATEGORIES IN 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	HIGH	MIDDLE	LOW		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	2.12	1.90	1.70	192.36	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Activities external to the classroom	11.61	10.54	10.15	189.25	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher/student/parent relationships	17.41	14.62	13.05	513.86	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	19.25	18.40	17.83	122.74	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.55	19.01	18.61	121.67	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.56	7.06	6.98	75.02	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Discipline problems	10.22	8.96	8.53	163.79	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
n	2478	2793	2952		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was the "High", group two was the "Middle", and group three was the "Low" socio-economic status category.

TABLE 29

MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SECONDARY TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CONDITIONS BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CATEGORIES IN 1981

SCHOOL CONDITIONS	SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS			F-RATIO[1]	SIGNIFICANT CONTRASTS[2]
	HIGH	MIDDLE	LOW		
Teacher satisfaction with relationships with parents	2.00	1.82	1.64	153.38	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Activities external to the classroom	11.21	10.56	10.18	113.27	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher/student/parent relationships	15.86	13.79	12.42	368.41	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Factors disruptive to classroom management	17.74	17.41	16.93	41.45	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Teacher influence upon instructional decisions	20.04	19.36	18.86	51.26	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
Staff interpersonal relationships	7.01	6.76	6.91	13.59	1>2; 2<3; 1>3
Discipline problems	9.91	9.06	8.49	140.78	1>2; 2>3; 1>3
n	3585	2791	2612		

[1]F-ratios that were greater than or equal to 4.70 were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

[2]Group contrasts identified were those statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Group one was the "High", group two was the "Middle" and group three was the "Low" socio-economic status category.

The suburban teachers were much more positive than the urban teachers in their perceptions of school conditions. Analysis of student perception of parental interest in school revealed that teachers were more positive in schools where students perceived their parents as interested in school. Socio-economic status had a strong relationship with the teacher perceptions. The higher socio-economic groups had teachers with more positive attitudes.

Conclusions

There were many items and areas where Pennsylvania teachers were positive about the operational conditions of schools. Many of the positive things could be reported or publicized. At the state level problem areas could be examined and interventions designed to improve these areas. Also, school administrators could use the state data in conjunction with building data to analyze strengths and deficiencies. The issue of teachers indicating in-service education did not meet teacher needs could be a serious problem. Certainly Pennsylvania teachers need to be kept informed of the latest work in educational improvements and their teaching skills refined over the years. This could be accomplished through high quality teacher in-service education which may not be happening in some school districts. Other problem areas should be selected, reviewed and analyzed and for some areas considered for additional work.

The problem of including or excluding Philadelphia or Pittsburgh teachers when calculating state norms on teacher perceptions was of little importance based on the findings. Some of the negative urban teacher responses were of greater concern. The clear pattern of more negative perceptions indicated problems and issues that need attention in Pennsylvania urban school districts.

The statistical relationship between several variables and teacher perceptions was of great interest. Class size, population density, student perceptions of parental interest in school and socio-economic status were linked statistically to teacher perceptions. Those variables had for several teacher perception areas of school conditions extremely high F-ratios. It was evident small classes, in the suburbs, with interested parents and high socio-economic levels were related to positive teacher perceptions for Pennsylvania teachers.

References

Crisp, Raymond D., The Professional Competency of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers: A Report of the Self-Evaluations of Experienced Illinois Secondary English Teachers, Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers, Urbana, Illinois, 1968. (ED 029889)

Earp, N. Wesley and Fred W. Tanner, A Continuing Study of the NTSU Elementary Graduates in Their First Year of Teaching, Research on Elementary Teacher Preparation, Monagraph No. 3, 1975. (ED 126002)

Holdaway, Edward A., Satisfaction of Teachers in Alberta with Their Work and Working Conditions, Alberta University, Department of Educational Administration Study, Edmonton, Alberta, 1978. (ED 151948)

McCaskill, Edwin O., et al., A Research Study About Teachers' Perceptions of Job Satisfaction, 1979. (ED 184205)

Muse, Ivan D. and Loya Stonehocker, A Study of Small Rural High Schools of Less Than 200 Students: Perceptions of Teachers and Administrators, American Educational Research Association Paper, San Francisco, California, 1979. (ED 168778)

Newman, Katherine K., Middle-Aged Experienced Teachers' Perceptions of Their Career Development, American Educational Research Association Paper, San Francisco, California, 1979. (ED 171697)

Pennsylvania Department of Education, Educational Quality Assessment Manual for Interpreting School Reports, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1981.

Smith, Mary Lee and Gene V. Glass, Relationship of Class-Size to Classroom Processes, Teacher Satisfaction and Pupil Affect: A Meta-Analysis, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California, 1979. (ED 190698)

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS: Each of the following items is a problem for some teachers in some schools. Check the degree to which each one is a problem to you in your current assignment by using these definitions: Not a problem--has little or not affect on student performance; Moderate problem--has only limited effect on student performance; Serious problem--has considerable effect on student performance; Critical problem--has crucial effect on student performance.

A = Not a Problem
B = Moderate Problem
C = Serious Problem
D = Critical Problem

1. The students in this school aren't really interested in learning
2. Too many of my students are indifferent to school
3. There are too few activities which recognize the talent of our students
4. The different races or ethnic groups don't get along well together
5. There is little emphasis on vocational development
6. There is no time or place for students and teachers to interact outside of the classroom
7. Not enough teachers are involved in helping students overcome problems
8. Not enough teachers actively participate in extracurricular activities
9. There is not enough parent-teacher interaction
10. Too many parents take little or no interest in their children's school work
11. The quality of teacher-parent interaction is not good
12. When a problem arises involving a community group, the teachers have little input into the solution
13. The parents do not support what the school does
14. The parents do not place a high value on education
15. Students in this school have poor study habits
16. The achievement levels of my students are too heterogeneous
17. Health and nutrition problems seem to affect the learning of my students
18. The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning
19. The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students
20. My students are chronically absent from school
21. Physical facilities of this school limit the kinds of programs provided for students
22. I work with too many students each day
23. Lack of freedom to teach the way I want to makes me less effective with my students
24. Teachers have little control over matters such as textbook selection, curriculum and instructional programs
25. When new curriculum programs are initiated, I am not consulted or trained
26. There are too many outside interruptions during class periods
27. I have to spend too much time on non-instructional duties
28. My teaching is limited by the quality of or lack of instructional equipment and materials
29. Having to teach special education students in regular classes is a problem
30. The support staff in this school is not cooperative
31. The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together
32. There is too little teacher input in solving administrative problems
33. There is little interaction among teachers in this school, i.e. everyone is doing his/her own thing
34. In-service education provided by the district does not meet my needs
35. Too much time is spent on discipline problems
36. The values held by the students are in conflict with those of the school
37. Too little support on discipline is provided by administrators
38. Too little support on discipline is given by the parents
39 Disruption of my class(es) by students is a continuing frustration

APPENDIX B

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Where did you graduate from high school?
   A. In or within 30 miles of the boundaries of this school district
   B. More than 30 miles but less than 100 miles from the present boundaries of this school district
   C. One hundred miles or more from the boundaries of this school district

2. In your teaching situation, how satisfied are you with your relationships with parents and parent groups?
   A. Very Satisfied
   B. Somewhat Satisfied
   C. Somewhat Dissatisfied
   D. Very Dissatisfied

3. Which of the following best describes your level of formal education?
   A. No degree
   B. Bachelor's degree
   C. Master's degree or equivalency
   D. Master's degree plus one year
   E. Doctor's degree

4. Including this year, how many years of teaching experience do you have?

5. What is your average class size? (Exclude supervisory duties such as study hall.)